

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

NICOLE STARGELL EL BEY,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:24-cv-219

vs.

COMMON PLEAS COURT OF MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY JUVENILE DIVISION, *et al.*,

District Judge Michael J. Newman  
Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING *PRO SE* PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO LIFT HOLD FOR  
UNNECESSARY DELAY (Doc. No. 5)**

---

This case is before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Nicole Stargell El Bey’s motion to lift hold for unnecessary delay. Doc. No. 5.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff first filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 1), and this Court granted her motion (Doc. No. 2). When a plaintiff files for *in forma pauperis*, the law requires the Court to screen Plaintiff’s complaint to determine, in part, if this action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *see also Benson v. O’Brian*, 179 F.3d 1014, 1016 (6th Cir. 1999) (holding district courts can screen an *in forma pauperis* plaintiff’s complaint). This screening process is the next step in Plaintiff’s case in its Order granting Plaintiff’s *in forma pauperis* motion. Doc. No. 2 at PageID 117-18. Furthermore, the Court also explains this process in its [Pro Se Guide for Civil Litigants](#). *See United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, A Guide for Pro Se Civil Litigants: Representing Yourself in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio* (2017), <https://www.ohsd.uscourts.gov/pro-se-handbook>.

---

<sup>1</sup> As with all *pro se* litigants, Plaintiff’s documents and allegations are liberally construed in her favor. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (*per curiam*).

The screening process takes time because the Court has many cases on its docket. Since this Court is still in the process of screening Plaintiff's complaint, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion to lift hold for unnecessary delay. Doc. No. 5.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

April 2, 2025

s/Michael J. Newman  
Hon. Michael J. Newman  
United States District Judge